

Remarks

Regarding the objection to the disclosure, the "previously indicated descriptive wording" has been deleted from Figs. 2 and 6A; the specification was previously amended to include the reference numerals used in Figs. 4A, 5B and 6A; the specification has herein been amended to include a description relating to reference numbers 410 and 420 in Figs. 6A and 6B; and reference numerals used in the amended description of Fig. 5B have been brought into correspondence with Fig. 5B.

Regarding the objection to the drawings, the central referenced label 114b has been changed to 114c.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the objection to the disclosure and the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the art rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a duplexer dielectric filter as set forth in the claims (as amended) is neither taught nor suggested by Turunen et al., taken alone or in combination with the other art of record.

The "open area" of the duplexer dielectric filter set forth in the claims 1 and 12 is connected to a conductive material free open area of the upper surface (see Figs. 3, 4A and 4B). In the duplex filter of Turunen et al., the non-conductive or open areas disposed on the front side surface are separated from the open area of the upper surface of the ceramic block by the conductive area pattern 7.

Also, "coupling" described at col. 4, lines 25-32 of Turunen et al. is different from the coupling employed in the present invention. The "coupling" in the duplex filter of Turunen et al. is a means for isolating the two filters T1 and R4, thereby minimizing the electromagnetic interference (unwanted coupling). In contrast, the coupling in the duplexer dielectric filter of claims 1 and 12 is a capacitive coupling for forming an attenuation pole at the lower portion of the frequency band exhibited in the reception area.


Further, the duplexer dielectric filter of claims 1 and 12 is further limited by providing the recited open area on the side surface only at the portion corresponding to reception area, whereas in the duplex filter of Turunen et al., the open areas are disposed on the side surface at the portions corresponding to reception area as well as transmission area.

The teachings of McVeety et al. do not overcome the fundamental deficiency of Turunen et al. as a teaching reference vis-a-vis the claimed subject matter. Neither reference discloses nor suggests providing a duplexer filter with a higher frequency band in the reception area than in the transmission area by disposing open areas on the side surface only within the reception area.

In view of the foregoing, request is made for timely issuance of a notice of allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP


By 
Don W. Bulson, Reg. No. 28,192

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING (37 CFR 1.8a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper or thing referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: May 12, 2003


Don W. Bulson

H:\152\DWB\CHUN\PI\0155\IP0155US.R03.wpd